

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WILLIE JAMES ELLIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

PROSPECT AIRPORT SERVICES and
MACARTHUR & MACARTHUR,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-13852

Honorable Laurie J. Michelson

Magistrate Judge Stephanie Dawkins Davis

ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S MAY 1, 2019 FILING

In a prior opinion, this Court addressed Ellis' request to file an amended complaint. This Court held that "the causal connection between Ellis' July 2016 EEOC charge and the denial of his unemployment benefits is not plausible." *Ellis v. Prospect Airport Servs.*, No. 17-13852, 2019 WL 1417163, at *7 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 29, 2019). Thus, this Court did permit amendment. But, at the conclusion of its opinion and order, the Court stated,

Ellis is given until May 1, 2019 to decide whether to pursue an amended claim of retaliation based on Prospect's opposition to his application for unemployment benefits. If Ellis should attempt to replead that claim, he must fully account for the analysis in this opinion and his amended complaint must be docketed by May 1, 2019. The Federal Pro Se Legal Assistance Clinic may be able to advise Ellis whether a repleading would be legally supportable. If no amended complaint is filed by May 1, Ellis' claim of retaliation based on Prospect's opposition to his application for unemployment benefits will be dismissed with prejudice. All other claims against Prospect are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as of now.

Id. at *8.

On May 1, 2019, Ellis did file a response to this Court's opinion and order. And in that response, Ellis makes clear that he wishes "to continue [his] case against Prospect." (ECF No. 44, PageID.479.) But Ellis' response is not an amended complaint as this Court ordered. And the

response does not establish a plausible “causal connection between Ellis’ July 2016 EEOC charge and the denial of his unemployment benefits.” *See* 2019 WL 1417163, at *7. Accordingly, “Ellis’ claim of retaliation based on Prospect’s opposition to his application for unemployment benefits [is] dismissed with prejudice.” *See id.* at *8. As no other claims remain in this case, this case is DISMISSED. A judgment will follow.

SO ORDERED.

s/Laurie J. Michelson
LAURIE J. MICHELSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: May 9, 2019

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and/or pro se parties on this date, May 9, 2019, using the Electronic Court Filing system and/or first-class U.S. mail.

s/William Barkholz
Case Manager